

REMARKS

Claims 9 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1, 5-8, 10, 11 and 13 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found at FIGS. 6A-6C and pages 17-22 of the specification. The features of claims 9 and 12 have been incorporated into claims 7 and 10, respectively.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 11 and 13 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH:

As mentioned above, claims 8 and 11 have been amended for clarification purposes. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ARNOLD (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,275,848)(previously cited) IN VIEW OF SUZUKI (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,440,551) (newly cited):

The present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to an electronic mail system for delivering electronic mail sent from a sender to the appropriate receiver. The system comprises an attached file separating means for separating, in the case of an attached file being added to electronic mail sent from the sender, the attached file from the electronic mail. The system further comprises attached file transferring means for transferring the attached file separated from the electronic mail by the attached file separating means to a predetermined server by using a user account and a password, and store location information adding means for adding store location information indicating a location where the attached file transferred by the attached file transferring means is stored to the electronic mail. The system further comprises log-in account information adding means for adding the user account and password to the electronic mail.

Neither Arnold nor Suzuki, individually or combined, disclose "attaching file transferring means for transferring the attached file separated from the electronic mail by the attached file separating means to a predetermined server by using a user account and password," as recited in amended claim 1, for example. Nor do the foregoing references, individually or combined, disclose a "log-in account information adding means for adding the user account and password to the electronic mail," as recited in amended claim 1, for example.

Instead, Arnold discloses in FIG. 2, an apparatus for automated referencing of electronic information. The apparatus includes means for receiving a message having at least one

attachment, means for applying detachment rules to the message including criteria for detachment, and means for sending the message to at least one recipient (see column 2, lines 20-26 and column 4, lines 9-17). Specifically, the apparatus applies predetermined criteria to determine whether an attachment to a message should be detached (operations 208 and 210 of FIG. 2). If the criteria is met, the attachment is placed in a remote location (operation 212 of FIG. 2) which can be accessed by the recipients of the email message and the apparatus then creates a pointer in the text of the email message which directs the recipients to the appropriate Web site (operation 214 of FIG. 2) (see column 3, lines 48-56). Arnold does not disclose the use of a user account and password when transferring the attachment to a remote place in operation 212).

Suzuki discloses a multimedia packet communication system having a multimedia protocol structure including an application layer providing quality parameters such as a data size, a delay/throughput and a reliability against an error to a user datagram protocol (UDP) which is a transport layer of a lower order, a transmission control protocol (TCP), and a stream type transport protocol for a moving picture together with an address of the other party (see column 3, lines 26-40). Further, in FIG. 2, Suzuki, illustrates a format for mapping of mode selection in response to requiring parameters for a delay and throughput (see column 3, lines 45-56).

Thus, although Suzuki discloses method for transferring data, Suzuki fails to make up for the deficiencies of Arnold mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of Arnold and Suzuki fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept 19, 2005

By: Deidre M. Davis
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501